

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

### **Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes February 27, 2003**

#### **1. Call to Order**

Chairman David Alfano called the meeting to order at 6:13 p.m.

#### Members Attending:

Chairman David Alfano, Michael Barnes, Cathy Baylock, Maureen Brooks, Robert Cronin, Matt Grocott, Mike Harding, Marc Hershman, Colleen Jordan, Tom Koos, Sue Lempert, Karyl Matsumoto, Mark Meadows, and Deborah Ruddock.

#### Staff/Guest Attending:

Rich Napier, Walter Martone and Geoff Kline - C/CAG Staff; Howard Young – Portola Valley; Maggie Gomez – Daly City; Mo Sharma – Daly City; Robert Ovadia – Daly City; Joseph Lo Coco; San Mateo County; Brian Fletcher – Callender Associates; Merrill Buck – San Bruno; Barry Nagel – South San Francisco; Steve Carlson – South San Francisco; Dennis Chuck – South San Francisco; Dennis Frank – San Mateo; Lynne Davis – Portola Valley; Gary Heap – San Mateo; Van Ocampo – Pacifica; Raymund Donguines – Pacifica.

#### **2. Public Comments On Items Not On The Agenda**

- None.

#### **3. Minutes of August 22, 2002 meeting.**

*Committee Member Lempert MOVED the approval of the minutes. Committee Member Matsumoto SECONDED. MOTION PASSED unanimously.*

#### **4. Update on the status of current TDA projects.**

Staff noted that there are a number of projects that are falling behind in meeting certain project milestones. Two of these projects may not be able to meet the deadlines for completing the project. Both of these project sponsors will be scheduled to make a presentation on the status of the projects to the BPAC at the March meeting.

#### **5. Presentations on proposed TDA projects for 2003-04 and development of recommendations for funding.**

The Committee received presentations on the twelve applicant projects. Following the presentations there were questions and answers. After all of the presentations were completed the Committee held

a round table discussion on all of the projects. This was an opportunity for the members to ask questions, give impressions, state concerns, discuss issues, state positive attributes, etc. for the various projects. The committee members then individually completed a scoring sheet for each of the twelve projects. After the scoring was completed, the scores were recorded, totaled and an overall average was developed. When all of the projects were completely scored and the averages recorded, a ranking of the projects and a cumulative allocation of the funds was established. The charts displaying this information are attached to these minutes.

For the projects not being recommended for funding, the following are some of the concerns raised by the Committee members during discussion:

- Daly City Lake Merced Blvd Bike Path: Some members felt that this was more of a pedestrian than a bicycle project and should have been presented as such. A preference was indicated for widening the road and installing real bike paths.
- Portola Valley Multi-Use Trail: There continues to be concern that putting pedestrians, bicycles, and horses on a trail together that is narrow in certain areas, may cause problems.
- San Mateo County Bunker Hill Pedestrian Improvements: It was noted that this is a location where children really are walking to school. Concern was expressed that this project is not included in any bicycle plan.
- San Mateo County "A" Street Pedestrian Improvements: In the future the County should consider taking its projects to the C/CAG BPAC for advice early on in the application process. This project application seemed like it was put together very hurriedly and not well thought out. Concern was expressed about disturbing certain heritage trees.
- Daly City Cow Palace Entrance: These improvements appear to provide more benefits to the Cow Palace than to the pedestrians. The Cow Palace and/or the City of San Francisco should be making a greater contribution and commitment to the project. The Cow Palace itself is in need of renovation. This project will greatly improve the entrance to the Palace, yet the Palace does not seem to be interested in extending the improvements to the center itself. Daly City requested that consideration be given to providing some funding to do some limited improvements such as lighting and crosswalk improvements.
- San Bruno Tanforan Shopping Center: Concern was expressed that these improvements should have been negotiated as part of the development agreement for that vicinity. The developer should have been required to contribute toward this project.
- San Mateo County Santa Cruz Avenue Sidewalks: This project is potentially in conflict with/ or duplicating another crossing project that was done by the City of Menlo Park. This project was presented to the Menlo Park Bike Committee. They allowed the application to go forward but did not endorse it because of confusion over how it related to the other Menlo Park project.

***Motion: to fully fund the five top scoring projects and to tentatively approve projects six through nine for funding in the event that funding is recovered due to projects not meeting deadlines from previous cycles of TDA. The balance of funds remaining after all of these projects are funded will be addressed by the BPAC at a later meeting.***  
***Lempert/Harding/Jordan, unanimous.***

It was also suggested that an item be put on the agenda for the next BPAC meeting to discuss improvements for the next cycle of TDA Article 3 funding.

#### **6. Member Communications.**

There are now a number of new members of BPAC. It was recommended that copies of the C/CAG Comprehensive Bike Route Plan be provided to all members. It was also recommended that an orientation for new members and others who are interested, be provided. Chairman Alfano suggested that BPAC members, who have suggestions for orientation items, provide them to him via e-mail.

#### **7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 p.m.

NEXT MEETING DATE - March 27, 2003.